

Comment on “Coexistence of Superconductivity and Ferromagnetism in Ferromagnetic Metals [1]”.

Yogesh N. Joglekar¹ and Allan H. MacDonald²

¹ *Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544,*

² *Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We argue that a single-band itinerant electron model with short-range interactions, proposed by Karchev *et al.* [1], cannot describe the coexistence of superconducting and ferromagnetic order.

In a recent Letter [1] Karchev *et al.* proposed a model for the coexistence of s -wave superconductivity and ferromagnetism, in which both orders arise from itinerant electrons. It has been investigated further in a recent preprint [2]. The results presented in [1] are based on a model with a *local* electron-electron interaction of the form $-J\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}}/2 - gn_{\uparrow\downarrow}n_{\mathbf{r}\downarrow}$. In this comment, we point out that the Hubbard-Stratonovich (HS) transformation used in [1] predicts an ordered state even in the case of *non-interacting* electrons. Although the HS approach is attractive for the physical transparency it brings to the study of quantum fluctuations in ordered states, it tends not describe the microscopic competition between different possible types of order well. The evidently incorrect inference mentioned above, and the well-known [3] property that HS transformation can be used to derive Hartree or Fock but not Hartree-Fock mean-field equations, are examples of this difficulty. In this comment we show explicitly that the model considered in [1], when treated by a Hartree-Fock mean-field theory, leads to a physically sensible phase-diagram that does not support simultaneous ferromagnetism and s -wave superconductivity [4].

Using the identity $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} = 3(n_{\mathbf{r}\uparrow} + n_{\mathbf{r}\downarrow})/4 - 3n_{\mathbf{r}\uparrow}n_{\mathbf{r}\downarrow}/2$, the local interaction can be written as $-\tilde{J}\lambda\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}}/2 - \tilde{g}(1 - \lambda)n_{\mathbf{r}\uparrow}n_{\mathbf{r}\downarrow}$ for arbitrary λ , where $\tilde{J} \equiv (J - 4g/3) = -4\tilde{g}/3$. In [1] ordered states can occur even for the non-interacting case, $\tilde{J} = 0 = \tilde{g}$, indicating breakdown of the HS mean-field theory. To cast the subsequent discussion in a transparent Hartree-Fock language, we perform a particle-hole transformation on the down-spin, $c_{\downarrow}(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow d_{\downarrow}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{r})$. The Hamiltonian expressed in terms of d -fermions is given by

$$H = \sum_{\sigma\sigma'\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} [\xi_{\mathbf{k}}\tau^z - \tilde{g}(1 - \lambda)\mathbf{1}]_{\sigma\sigma'} d_{\mathbf{k}\sigma'} + \int d\mathbf{r} \left[\frac{\tilde{J}}{2} \lambda \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} + \frac{\tilde{g}}{2} (1 - \lambda)(n_{\mathbf{r}\uparrow}^d + n_{\mathbf{r}\downarrow}^d)^2 \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\xi_{\mathbf{k}} = \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \mu - g/2$ is energy measured from a shifted chemical potential, $n_{\mathbf{r}\sigma}^d(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}})$ is the number (spin) operator for d -fermions at position $\mathbf{r}$, and we have used the identities $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} = -\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}}$ and $2n_{\uparrow\downarrow}n_{\downarrow\uparrow} = (3n_{\uparrow\downarrow}^d + n_{\downarrow\uparrow}^d - (n_{\uparrow\downarrow}^d + n_{\downarrow\uparrow}^d)^2)$ to derive Eq.(1). In this language s -wave superconductivity corresponds to nonzero $\hat{x}\hat{y}$ spin-

polarization for the d -fermions. The local interaction above is the sum of density ($g_n n_d^2/2$) and isotropic spin-dependent ($g_s \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{S}/2$) contributions which give rise to Hartree mean-fields $g_n n_d \mathbf{1}$ and $g_s \vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{m}/4$, and exchange mean fields $-g_n(n_d \mathbf{1} + \vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{m})/2$ and $-g_s(3n_d \mathbf{1} - \vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{m})/8$ respectively. Here $n_d(\vec{m}) = \int_{\mathbf{k}} \langle d_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger}(\vec{\tau}) d_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$ is the average d -fermion number (spin) density, $g_n = \tilde{g}(1 - \lambda)$, $g_s = \tilde{J}\lambda$, and we have used $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} d_{\mathbf{r}\alpha}^{\dagger} d_{\mathbf{r}\beta} d_{\mathbf{r}\gamma}^{\dagger} d_{\mathbf{r}\delta} (2\delta_{\alpha\delta}\delta_{\beta\gamma} - \delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\gamma\delta})$ to evaluate the mean-field contributions from the spin-dependent interaction. Although the Hartree and exchange contributions individually depend on λ , the Hartree-Fock mean-field Hamiltonian is *independent* of this arbitrary parameter, thereby satisfying a minimum requirement for physically meaningful conclusions. In contrast, a naive HS approach which includes only the Hartree (or exchange) self-energy gives an unphysical λ -dependent mean-field Hamiltonian [1, 2].

The resulting Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian

$$H_{MF} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} d_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}^{\dagger} \left[\xi_{\mathbf{k}}\tau^z - \frac{\tilde{g}M}{2}\mathbf{1} - \Delta\tau^x \right]_{\sigma\sigma'} d_{\mathbf{k}\sigma'} \quad (2)$$

is easily diagonalized to yield the quasiparticle energies $E_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = -\tilde{g}M/2 \pm \sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta^2}$. Here M is the ferromagnetic order-parameter and $\Delta = \tilde{g}m_x/2$ is (purely real) superconducting order-parameter. The self-consistent equations for M and Δ are

$$M = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} [1 - n_{+}(\mathbf{k}) - n_{-}(\mathbf{k})], \quad (3)$$

$$1 = 2\tilde{g} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{n_{-}(\mathbf{k}) - n_{+}(\mathbf{k})}{\sqrt{\xi_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \Delta^2}}. \quad (4)$$

These equations are similar to Eqs.(6) and (7) in [1] *but contain only one effective coupling constant $\tilde{g}$* . For $\tilde{g} < 0$ Eq.(4) implies that $\Delta = 0$, and it follows from Eq.(3) that $M \neq 0$ solutions can occur only if $\tilde{g} \leq \tilde{g}_c$ where $\tilde{g}_c$ is determined by Stoner's criterion. For $\tilde{g} > 0$ we get the BCS solution, $\Delta \propto \exp(-1/\tilde{g}\mathcal{N})$, and Eq.(3) implies that $M = 0$.

We conclude that coexistence of superconductivity and ferromagnetism requires physics beyond that of a single-band model with short-range interactions, and that HS based mean-field approximations must be used with caution [7, 8], especially when separate terms in the inter-

action Hamiltonian are represented by different auxiliary fields.

-
- [1] N.I. Karchev *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 846 (2001).
 - [2] J. Jackiewicz *et al.*, cond-mat/0302449.
 - [3] J.W. Negele and H. Orland, *Quantum Many Body Systems*

(Addison Wesley, New York, 1988).

- [4] We do not concentrate on the energies or regimes-of-validity of various mean-field phases [5, 6] because the HS mean-field theory breaks down at an earlier stage.
- [5] Y. Zhou *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 069701 (2003).
- [6] R. Shen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 069702 (2003).
- [7] A.K. Kerman *et al.*, Ann. Phys. **148**, 436 (1983).
- [8] Y.N. Joglekar and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 155315 (2001).